REMARKS

In the Office action mailed November 5, 2003, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 § 102(e) based on U.S. Patent No. 6,345,279 to Li et al., and claims 6-8 were objected to has being misnumbered. Applicant thanks the Examiner for renumbering misnumbered claims 7-9 as claims 6-8. Applicant traverses the rejections under § 102, but nevertheless amends the claims as shown above.

Statement of Related Patent Applications

Applicants initially inform the Examiner that the present application is related to co-pending U.S. Patent Applications No. 09/680,675 entitled NETWORK DATA TRANSFER ACCELERATION SYSTEM AND METHOD and 09/680,997 entitled IMAGE TRANSFER SYSTEM AND METHOD, both of which were also filed on October 6, 2000 by inventors Christopher Peiffer and Israel L'Heureux. Applicants have amended the specification of the present application to include a cross reference to these related patent applications. Further, applicants submit herewith an Information Disclosure Statement containing office actions from these related applications.

Claim Rejections

The following is a quotation from Page 3 of the Office action.

> Filtering at least a portion of the non-renderable data from the requested web page source data, thereby creating modified web page source data (column 5 lines 27-67, Li discloses filtering and transcoding text summarization, document headings, comments and the like from a web page),

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the contention that Li discloses filtering

non-renderable data from requested web page source data. Rather, the alleged non-renderable data of Li is actually renderable on the client device.

Careful examination of the Li reference shows that Li appears to disclose a process for "transcoding," to generate different versions of a multimedia document 100 at different "resolutions." The meaning of resolution is difficult to ascertain with particularity from the reference, but examples are given for images, video, text and audio. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that "non-renderable character data" is filtered, and thus only Li's discussion of text will be addressed.

Li appears to disclose that a text content item from a multimedia document may be transcoded to the following resolutions: key terms, text summary, and document headings. These are presumably are "low" resolutions, while the actual full text of the content item would be a "high" resolution. Li suggests that both the low resolution version of the content item and the high resolution version of the content item are displayable on the client device.

Li's disclosure of transcoding a multimedia document from a full text version to a version including only key terms, does not anticipate claim 1, because claim 1 requires that the filtered data be non-renderable data. Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that "the renderable character data [is] data that affects the presentation of the web page by a browser," while the "non-renderable character data [is] data that does not affect the presentation of the web page by a browser." Clearly, since the key words and full text of Li may be displayed on the client, these are outside the scope non-renderable character data as that term is used in claim 1.

Applicants further note that Li's disclosure of lossy and lossless compression (see Li at Col. 5 lines 33 and 51), is different than filtering out non-renderable data, since the data of Li in its pre-compressed state is data that is renderable on the client. Therefore the disclosure of lossy and lossless compression in Li does not anticipate claim 1.

With regard to client devices that have limited capabilities, Li appears to disclose, for example at Col. 12 line 1 et seq., preparing different versions of the multimedia document and selecting a particular version as a customized document for display on the client device based on the capabilities of the client device. This requires that the client device inform the acceleration device about its capabilities, which would requires valuable network resources and further slow down the communication process. The acceleration device disclosed in the subject application has been designed to speed up web traffic. Claim 1 requires that non-renderable data be "data that does not affect the presentation of the web page by a browser." Claim 1 does not define non-renderable data to be data that is not able to be displayed on a specific client device due to lack of capabilities. This difference is significant, because it enables the devices constructed according to the claimed method not to have inquire to the client device about its capabilities.

Thus, the transcoded versions of documents disclosed by Li, which cannot be displayed on a particular client device are not non-renderable character data as that term is used in claim 1, because they can, indeed, be rendered on browsers of other client devices. Note that the specific examples of non-renderable character data given in dependent claim 12 comport with this use of the term, since none of these non-renderable character data examples are displayed on web browsers running on even the most capable of computing

devices. This is because by their very nature, according to standardized implementations of the HTML language used worldwide, these data types are not displayed to end users. Thus, Li's disclosure of customized multimedia documents tailored to a particular client devices capabilities does not anticipate claim 1.

For the above reasons applicants believe that claim 1, and dependent claims 2-8, are allowable. Applicants further submit that newly added claims 9-18, which also depend from claim 1, are similarly allowable. Applicants further believe that newly added device claims 19-42 are allowable.

The above amendments and remarks are believed to address fully the Examiner's rejections, and place the application in condition for allowance. A prompt indication of the same respectfully is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned if any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephonic interview.

"Express Mail" Mailing Label No.
EV479388364US
Date of Deposit – May 4, 2004

I hereby certify that the enclosed correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313.

George Painter
George Painter
Date of Signature: May 4, 2004

Respectfully submitted,
KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.

Reg # 43,653

M. Matthews Han for

Mark D. Alleman
Customer No. 23581
Registration No. 42,257
of Attorneys for Applicants
520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 224-6655
Facsimile: (503) 295-6679